

would be 36.6 percent higher if women were paid as much as men.

However, inequalities within the Social Security system are not only to blame for women receiving less benefits than men. The wage gap continues to hinder equality among recipients based on gender. Although the Equal Pay Act became public in 1963, making it illegal to pay women lower rates for the same job strictly on the basis of sex, almost 4 decades later the wage gap among women and men persists and this has a direct impact on Social Security. At the end of 2001, women's average monthly retirement benefit was, on average, \$229 less than men's. Our retirement system is employment based, and women are unfairly penalized as they reach retirement age.

However, Social Security was designed to be a guaranteed source of income for retired persons. Although both genders can sometimes find their benefits exhausted, women are particularly at risk. In my State of Indiana, not only is Social Security a necessity among women. It is crucial to many retirees, families, and disabled workers. In Indiana, benefits were paid to close to 1 million persons during the month of December, 2000. This number included over 600,000 retired workers, over 100,000 widows and widowers, over 100,000 disabled workers, almost 60,000 wives and husbands, and over 80,000 children. Social Security beneficiaries represent 16 percent of the total population of the State of Indiana, 95 percent of Indiana's population age 65 and older.

Social Security is the heart of our Nation's insurance. When it was inspired and inaugurated under President Roosevelt in 1935, it was an excellent idea. It was a good idea then; it is a good idea now. It is both our fiscal and moral responsibility to provide our Nation's seniors, especially women, with the benefits that they so rightfully deserve. We cannot abandon our senior citizens and future generations. It would be a grave injustice to deprive them of Social Security benefits. Today's beneficiaries have worked long and hard, paid their taxes, earned their right to a happy and long retirement. It is the responsibility of Congress to make sure that this promise is kept.

In Indiana, over 700,000 people receive Social Security benefits. Of that 700,000, Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of those beneficiaries are women, many of whom live in borderline poverty. We must not privatize Social Security. We must secure Social Security, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXPANDING THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there is little arguing about the macroeconomic benefits of free and open trade. International trade agreements lower prices, they encourage higher productivity; and ultimately, they improve consumer choice. But these gains, no matter how significant to our economy, are net gains, because increases in imports usually contribute to a plant closing and worker layoffs. That is because the gains from international trade tend to be very large and are widely distributed throughout our economy. The U.S. economy's ability to create jobs is virtually unmatched by any other Nation.

Unfortunately, that is a simplistic view. The cost of imports are heavily concentrated by industry, location, and worker demographics. And while our economy has demonstrated an ability to create jobs, job creation does not always take place at the same location where jobs are lost. One need look no further than our last census for proof.

New jobs are in different industries than jobs lost. The vast majority of trade-related job losses are in the manufacturing sector. Between 1979 and 1999, 17 million American workers lost their jobs from manufacturing industries. However, during that same period of time, the United States added 39 million jobs. So essentially, for every job lost in the manufacturing sector, more than two jobs were created in the economy.

Almost all the net new jobs created have been in the service sector, which require new skills and, in many cases, do not provide the same wages or benefits which existed at a previous job.

So, yes, the fact remains that the macroeconomic gains from international trade almost always outweigh the cost. However, these costs are significant for individual workers and their families and to the towns and communities in which they live.

As we have seen in the past several years, the costs can undermine efforts to further liberalize trade, which is the position we find ourselves in tonight. Ours is a Nation built on commerce, and I support giving the executive branch the authority to negotiate with foreign nations to lower trade barriers.

We do not need 535 trade ambassadors. What we do need is a mechanism which allows the executive branch to negotiate on behalf of Congress and to ensure the will of Congress is respected in those negotiations.

So far, the legislation granting the President fast track trade negotiating authority has not lived up to this requirement; and as such, I have not supported it. One of the reasons the administration has not been able to rally support for fast track is because of the lousy job we have done in remedying the casualties of trade.

Now, by the way, this has gone on for a long time, for 40 years. Forty years ago, President Kennedy spoke of the need to ensure American workers who lose their jobs to imports are retrained for other careers. Quoting President Kennedy, he said: "Those injured by trade competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government. There is an obligation to render assistance to those who suffer as a result of national trade policy."

Those remarks culminated in the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program, or TAA, in 1962. At the time, the United States had an enormous trade surplus, imports only comprised 5 percent of the gross domestic product and manufacturing comprised 30 percent of total employment.

Fast forward to today, 40 years later. The share of imports of GDP has tripled, trade surplus has turned into a huge trade deficit and the manufacturing share of total employment has fallen to 13 percent. Despite our strong economic growth, it appears President Kennedy's comment is more relevant today than it was 40 years ago.

While TAA may not erase all the economic pain caused by dislocation, it has made the adjustment to a new job a little easier, and represents small compensation for the losses they and their families have experienced. However, there is a lot of room for improvement in the TAA program. We need to expand the program and ensure that it will offer financial support, retraining and relocation benefits as Americans work to upgrade their skills and transition into more complex jobs that offer them the best opportunity of reclaiming old earning levels.

The other body has made substantial inroads into improving the program in its consideration of fast track legislation, especially in the area that concerns most of us, and that is affordable health care.

Mr. Speaker, as millions of Americans have discovered, losing a good-paying job is bad enough; but losing health insurance is a straw that can break the camel's back. Health insurance is very expensive, which is why nearly one in seven Americans, or 39 million people, do not have health insurance. Currently, workers who lose their jobs are eligible for extended health care insurance which enables them to retain the health insurance they had at their jobs, but at four to six times the amount they formerly paid while employed.

The other body's proposal would remedy that situation by ensuring that TAA eligible workers would have a tax credit of 70 percent of their health insurance premiums. Workers would actually be able to afford health insurance as they seek retraining assistance, a key to ensuring that they finish their retraining. The other body's TAA tax credit provision guarantees